A

REVIEW

OF

Mr. T. B. S. MORRITT's

Vindication of Homer.

PUBLISHED IN THE

BRITISH CRITICK,

JANUARY 1st, and MARCH 1st,

1799.

Pieces referred to in the following Disquisition, are

Iſt. A Deſcription of the Plain of Troy, by M. Chevalier, tranſlated by Andrew Dalzell, Profeſſor of Greek, in the Univerſity of Edinburgh. Edinburgh, 1791.

IId. Obſervations upon a Treatiſe, entitled, A Deſcription of the Plain of Troy, by Monſieur le Chevalier, by Jacob Bryant. Eton, 1795.

IIId. A Diſſertation on the War of Troy, by Jacob Bryant. No Date.

IVth. A Vindication of Homer, by T. B. S. Morritt, Eſq. York, 1798.

Vth. Tableau de la Plaine de Troy, by Profeſſor Dalzell. Publiſhed in the Tranſactions of the Royal Society, Edinburgh, 1788.

VIth. Anſwer of Mr. Bryant to Mr. Morritt's Vindication.

VIIth. The Edition of Strabo quoted, is Caſaubon's. Paris. 1620.

Οὐδὲ ΠΟΙΗΤΗΣ πολύφωνός τις ὢν, καὶ πολυΐστωρ, δίδωσιν ἀφορμὰς, ὡς οὐδὲ τούτων ἀνήκοός ἐστι τῶν τόπων, εἴ τις ὀρθῶς βούλοιτο συλλογίζεσθαι ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν, τῶν τε χεῖρον λεγομένων περὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν ἄμεινον καὶ ἀληθέστερον.

Strabo, Lib. iii. p. 149.

MORRITT's

Vindication of Homer.

JANUARY 1.

TOWARDS the latter end of the laſt century, the French critics, with C. Perrault at their head, commenced an attack upon Homer, for the rudeneſs of his images, and the groſſneſs of his ſentiments. Boileau reſiſted the aſſault, by ſhowing that the language of ſimplicity, the ſcenery of nature, and the manners of mankind at large, were not to be meaſured by the ſtandard of Pariſian refinement.

The preſent century is drawing to a concluſion, with the appearance of another controverſy, in which we are not to contend for the merits of Homer, but almoſt for his exiſtence. On this queſtion the learned and venerable Mr. Jacob Bryant has challenged all opponents, and dared every ſpecies of hoſtility*, provided it be conducted with that candour and urbanity to which every man of learning, and, we add, particularly ſuch a man, has a claim.

* *Prejudice*, he calls it in the preface to his Diſſertation; and *candour* he claims in the concluſion of the introduction to his Obſervations.

Mr. Morrit has accepted the challenge, certainly without any of the prejudices which Mr. B. imputes to all his antagoniſts, and as certainly with all the candour that is due to Mr. B's acknowledged probity and erudition. But candour binds no one, according to the laws of controverſy, to paſs unnoticed lapſes ariſing rather from a ſpirit of ſyſtem than a diſregard to truth; and erudition never runs more to waſte, than when it is employed in contributing to a ſtream which is not pure at its ſource. It is the ſyſtem of Mr. B. and its principle which ought to be reſiſted; and if theſe prove erroneous, whatever tribute may be due to his talents, and the extent of his reading, they are but the trappings and the pageantry of his work.

Mr. B.'s arguments, with his corollaries and concluſions, amount, according to his table of contents, to one hundred and twenty-three. Out of theſe, Mr. M. has ſelected for diſcuſſion ſuch as require a more particular notice; and in this conſiſts the firſt part of his work. The latter part contains his obſervations made on the ſpot, while he was viſiting the Troad, warm with the love of Homer, and tracing the diſcovery of M. Chevalier with caution equal to his candour.

What has been already ſaid on this ſubject will be ſeen in vol. ix. of the Britiſh Critic, pp. 585, 591, and 604; and we are ready to confeſs, that when we firſt viewed the ſtream aſſumed by M. Chevalier for his Scamander, pleaſed as we were to ſee the geographical difficulties of the Iliad removed, we were not without ſcepticiſm as to the fact. We ſaw a brook of Mr. Wood's converted into a river by M. Chevalier, and a courſe of five miles augmented to ten or twelve; and when we reflected that Mr. Wood profeſſed to have traced the geography of the Troad on the ſpot, as well as M. Chevalier, we heſitated between two evidences equally entitled to credit. But it now appears, that Mr. Wood was deceived by the ſame error which miſled thoſe who had preceded him, and went four and twenty miles up into the crags of Ida, for what lay under his feet in the plain, and cloſe to the ſea-ſhore. That this is the fact, and that M. Chevalier's Scamander is really a *diſcovery*, we have now the evidence of ſeveral Engliſh gentlemen who viſited the plain

plain of Troy for the purpoſe of aſcertaining the truth; and Mr. Morrit, Mr. Stockdale, Mr. Dallaway, and Mr. Berners, all bear witneſs to the general accuracy of M. Chevalier's delineation of the tract. They all agree that the modern iſſue of the Scamander is artificial; that the line by which it is conducted is nearly ſtrait, and totally diſſimilar from the natural windings of a river; and that the bank is formed of the earth thrown out of the channel. They all aſſert that the old channel of the Scamander to its junction with the Simois, is ſtill viſible, ſtill capable of being traced through its whole extent, and ſtill receives the drippings of its ancient occupant, however now diverted in an oppoſite direction.

It is this diſcovery of the Scamander which unravels all the difficulties that have disfigured the geography of Homer, from the time of Strabo to the preſent day. We now have a Scamander for the troops to paſs in their daily route to the ſcene of action; a Scamander on the *left* of the Trojan line, fordable, without the ſhallowneſs of a brook, and ſo narrow, that a tree falling acroſs it, might well be ſaid to form a bridge from ſide to ſide. All theſe are circumſtances neceſſary to identify the ſtream we were to ſearch for, and they never could be found by thoſe who traced the eaſtern ſtream from its iſſue to its ſource.

It is neceſſary to inſiſt upon this point above all others, not only becauſe M. Chevalier's publication gave origin to the controverſy, but becauſe the reſtoration of the true geography overturns the whole hypotheſis of Mr. Bryant. If we admit his Egyptian Troy, we muſt not only rob the Phrygian Troy of its name, but its locality, and all the circumſtances peculiar to it's locality; a ſuppoſition extravagant beyond all bounds. If Homer's pictures of the plain of Troy were fictitious, his ſcene might be transferred to Egypt or to India; if it be true, the ſcene muſt be there only where the geography is conſiſtent with the truth. On this ſubject more will be ſaid when we come to conſider the ſecond part of Mr. Morritt's work; but our immediate buſineſs is with his refutation of Mr. Bryant's attack upon Homer.

Out of Mr. B's hundred and twenty-three diviſions

of his argument, Mr. M. has ſelected forty-one for animadverſion. Our readers will not expect from us the detail on either ſide, but we ſhall obſerve generally, that the nature of the defence is as ſimple as it is modeſt. It is, in truth, common ſenſe employed againſt a maſs of erudition; and a collection of evidence from the moſt approved authors, placed in oppoſition to the capricious judgment of the few and the moſt obſcure. The catalogue at the end of Mr. M.'s work gives a liſt of forty-three authors (and the number might be greatly increaſed) in oppoſition to three* names quoted at ſecond hand, to three writers† in *proſopria perſona*, to an epigram, and to Mr. Bryant himſelf; the only author who ever *imagined* that the ſcene of the Iliad was in Egypt.

The queſtion, however, is to be decided, not by numbers, but by argument; we ſhall begin therefore with the chronology‡.

Mr. B. objects to the whole chronology of Greece prior to the firſt Olympiad. Mr. M. conſiders this as drawing a line between hiſtory and fable, with a preciſion which can hardly be ſupported. He complains juſtly in another part of his work, that if the Hiſtory of the Trojan War be ſet aſide, it abrogates the whole Hiſtory of Greece, with which it is ſo interwoven, that both muſt ſtand or fall together; and that this is ſuch a ſweeping deluge, as even the incredulity of Mr. B. can hardly require. Now if we cannot vouch for the preciſion of the Arundelian marbles, which fix the taking of Troy on the night between the 11th and 12th of June§, in the year anſwering to 1184 before the Chriſtian æra; if we cannot aſcertain this fact within a century, or if we concede the whole to be a chronological accommodation ſuited to the tradition, yet that there is a poetical chronology conſiſtent with the poetical hiſtory in all its parts, is as evident, as that there is an hiſtorical chronology in any country this day in Europe.

* Anaxagoras, and Metrodorus, quoted by Diog. Laertius; *a perſon* by Athenæus.
† Baſil Magnus, Tatianus Aſſyr. Chryſoſtom.
‡ Morritt, p. 3.
§ See Blair.

The

The two moſt conſpicuous families of Greece, at Thebes and Mycenæ, coincide in all the leading facts relating to their poetical hiſtory, with as much order, and as much perſpicuity as the hiſtory of Sparta and Athens, in the time of the Peloponneſian war. They correſpond likewiſe with the families of Theſeus, Peleus, Æacus, Acriſius, Neſtor, and many others, in ſuch a chain of connexion, intercourſe, and mutual relation, that by conſulting the local hiſtories of each territory in Pauſanias, a more regular ſeries might be formed and arranged of theſe independent ſtates, than of our own Saxon heptarchy in this kingdom. That there is a mixture of fable or mythology interſperſed in this hiſtory, is granted; but that the whole ſhould be annihilated, requires the ſcepticiſm of a Bolingbroke. Let us try the experiment upon the family of the Pelops. Tantalus is the ſon of Jupiter Phrygius*, he reigned over Phrygia and Cappadocia; his ſon, Pelops, was driven out of Phrygia † by Illus; he came over into Greece; he married the daughter of Œnomaus, king of Elis; by inheritance or conqueſt, he obtained the chief power in the Peninſula, and gave it his own name; his family reigned at Mycenæ; their power extended over Corinth‡, Sicyon, Achaia, and Lacedæmon; the walls of Mycenæ were built by the Cyclopes§; the naval power of Mycenæ extended over many iſlands ‖ in the Ægean Sea. Here is a brief hiſtory without inconſiſtence; and, before it can be ſet aſide, we muſt annihilate two circumſtances of proof, which exiſt in full force at the preſent hour; theſe are, the name of Peloponneſus, and the walls of Mycenæ. Pauſanias ſaw thoſe walls ¶ thirteen hundred years after they

* Ζεὺς Φρυγίος. Zeus was of all countries. Ammonite, Cretan, Phrygian, and Olympian. Are not all the gods of Greece, and all the genealogies traced up to them, aſcribable to the firſt ſettlers from Phœnicia, Egypt, Aſia?

† Pauſan. Cor. p. 64. Eliac. 160.

‡ Strabo, p. 372.

§ Pauſan. cor. 59.

‖ Homer.

¶ The circumference was left, and the gate with the lions on it, as well as the treaſury of Agamemnon under ground. Who

 were

they were built, and Mr. Morritt has ſeen them in his laſt viſit to Greece. If now Mr. Bryant ſhould aſk whether Britain had its name from Brutus, it might be anſwered, that if the hiſtory of Brutus were ſupported by half this evidence, it would be credible; and this evidence, compared and connected in time with the family of Œdipus, at Thebes, and the other contemporary families, forms ſuch a body, that Mr. B. will hardly venture to puſh the controverſy further on this head.

From the general chronology of the houſe, we will proceed to that of an individual; for Mr. Bryant ſays, that Helen muſt be above an hundred years old at the concluſion of the war (M. p. 25); it is very ſtrange that he ſhould build this upon the authority of Scaliger, Petavius, and Clemens Alexandrinus, when he declares, at the ſame time, he places no truſt in their deductions. This is literally, as Homer ſays, raiſing an objection like a plaything, for the pleaſure of *kicking* it down.

Ῥεῖα μάλ', ὡς ὅτε τις ψάμαθον παΐς ἄγχι θαλάσσης
Ὅς' ἐπεὶ ἂν ποιήσῃ ἀθύρματα πηπιέῃσιν,
Αὖ αὖτις συνέχευε ποσὶν καὶ χερσὶν ἀθύρων.

Il. O. 362.

Now, the dates relating to Helen ſtand thus, in Blair:

Rape of Helen by Theſeus,	1213 A. C.
Rape of Helen by Paris, -	1198
Troy taken, - -	1184.

were the Cyclopes that built them? A nation driven out of Thrace, which ſettled in Aſia, and which came into Greece to work for hire. Strabo, lib. 8, 373. They built works at Mycenæ, others at Argos, Tiryns, and Orchomenus; whatever fable there be in their character as one-eyed monſters, their exiſtence as a nation is teſtified by Homer, Strabo, Euripides, Pauſanias, and many others, and by their works ſtill exiſting in 1798. It ſhould ſeem as if ſome civilized people had exiſted in Thrace previous to Grecian hiſtory, and been driven out by a Getic or Tartar invaſion: from this civilized people, the Greeks derived ſuch remnants of accounts, as they had of Orpheus, Linus, &c. &c. and the Cyclopes. The Cyclopes were not of a divine origin (Pauſ. 26), that is, not oriental; but giants, and next to the gods. The beſt hiſtory of them is found in the Scholiaſt of Euripides [Oreſtes. Lin. 963. Ed. Barn.] who calls Argos Γᾶ Κυκλωπία.

This

This ſtatement gives a ſpace of twenty-nine years, to which, if we add from twelve to fifteen for the age of Helen, it makes her forty-four at moſt, when the city was taken, and fifty-four at moſt when Telemachus ſaw her ſtill beautiful as a goddeſs, at the court of Sparta. Women, it muſt be confeſſed, are uſually ungoddeſſed at that age; but we have inſtances in our own days, that all do not loſe their attractions.

This however will be called, perhaps, the accommodation of chronology; but it is the duty of a chronologer, when he has facts to diſtribute, to reconcile them to each other, as much as it is the intereſt of the diſputant to puzzle and confound. Helen and Penelope were probably both of the ſame age. Both ſeem to have preſerved their charms; and though Penelope complains,

Θεοὶ δ' ὤπαζον εἴζυν
Οἱ νῶϊν ἀγάσαντο παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντε
Ἥβης ταρπῆναι. Od. ψ. 210.

Ulyſſes ſtill found her lovely, and

Ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἵκοντο. ψ. 296.

Number of Men and Ships. *B. p.* 20. *M. p.* 11.

Mr. B. is not content with aſſerting the incredibility of collecting the army which Agamemnon commanded, but he denies the poſſibility of finding ſuch a number of troops in ſo early an age; in anſwer to this, Mr. M. juſtly obſerves, that an uncivilized ſtate of ſociety is much more likely to produce armies of great magnitude, than a period after civilization has taken place. He inſtances the northern ſwarms which overwhelmed the Roman empire; and he might have added the Tartar invaſions, in all ages; the conqueſts of the Perſians, and thoſe of the Arabians, in the firſt ages of Mohammediſm. But Greece, if we take the picture of it from Homer, was in a ſituation of all others the moſt conducive to the increaſe of the human ſpecies. The people were not yet crouded into great cities for protection, or driven into them for the intereſt of their more powerful neighbours. But they were ſpread looſely

looſely over the whole ſurface of the country, living in ſmall towns, or rather villages, which are as favourable to population as great cities are noxious. This is likewiſe ſome proof that, notwithſtanding the predatory excurſions of the age, ſociety was comparatively in a ſtate of ſafety; for, in times of danger, the villages ceaſe, and the cities are crowded. Examine the catalogue of Homer with the aſſiſtance of Euſtathius, Strabo, and Pauſanias, and you find more names of places than his commentators can find ſituations to receive. Try the experiment upon Bœotia, and judge whether the population is not ſelf-evidently more numerous in that age than in the hiſtoric period, when Thebes was become the ſole potentate, and at laſt the tyrant and deſtroyer of Platæa and Orchomenus. The Æolian colony is 348 years prior to the firſt Olympiad, where Mr. B. commences the hiſtorical period, and 552 years before Crœſus, where Herodotus opens his narrative of events. The Ionian colony is dated 472 years previous to the reign of Crœſus; and both colonies afford proofs of the population of Greece, its vigour, and its ſtrength, in an age when Mr. B. ſuppoſes it in a ſtate of infancy. Does not the venerable controverſialiſt ſee, that if he will believe nothing prior to the firſt Olympiad, he muſt deny the exiſtence of theſe colonies, as well as the exiſtence of Agamemnon, Mycenæ, and Troy?

The numbers of the Greek army, as calculated by Thucydides, amount to 102,000 men, by no means an immoderate amount, even by compariſon with the forces in the Perſian war, if we conſider the countries which contributed to the ſupply. The forces at Platæa in that war were 110,000, including the Helots; in which armament, the Theſſalians, Phocæans, Bœotians, Argives, and the iſlands, had no ſhare; whereas, all were united under Agamemnon; and if the Greeks could have found a principle of union in the Perſian war, they might have doubled their numbers, at leaſt; for Peloponneſus alone contained 100,000 fighting men, if they could all have been brought into action.

The means of uniting ſo many independent ſtates under Agamemnon, it muſt be confeſſed, is the greateſt difficulty

difficulty relative to the war. The oaths of Helen's lovers were but a weak obligation, though the oath of a Greek was not ſo proverbial in that age as in the time of Polybius; but if the difficulty admits of a ſolution, it muſt be found in the ſuperior power of the Houſe of Atreus, compared with the reſt of Greece. Agamemnon had an hundred ſhips, Menelaus ſixty, and ſixty were lent by Agamemnon to Arcadia. The power of Menelaus extended over Meſſene; and Argos* was in ſome degree dependent upon Mycenæ. The only territories in the Peloponneſus not dependent, ſeem to be Pylos and Elis, and Homer is very expreſs in marking the ſuperior forces of Agamemnon both in number and quality,

Ἀτρείδης· ἅμα τῷ γε πολὺ πλεῖστοι ϗ ἄριστοι
Λαοὶ ἕποντ'. B. Cat. 84.

According to Mr. Bryant's own eſtimate, if the Pylians and Eleans are taken out of the account, the forces of the ſons of Atreus would amount to 25,500 men; and this number, compared with the followers of any other chief, will account for the influence of Mycenæ over the reſt of Greece, in a manner that may ſatisfy any common doubter. Achilles, the moſt conſidered of all the chiefs, brought only 2500 myrmidons to the war†.

Miſrepreſentation of cited Paſſages.

It is a ſerious thing to bring ſuch a charge, againſt a man of Mr. B.'s acknowledged probity, as a neglect of veracity; and, indeed, Mr. M. with candour equal to

* This may be collected from Homer, who ſays of Agamemnon, ϗ Ἄργει παντὶ ἀνάσσειν, b. 108. including, as it ſhould ſeem, all Argolis, or, in a larger ſenſe, all Peloponneſus. In a ſimilar manner Phœnix and Menoetius were kings in Theſſaly under Peleus. Euripides at leaſt favours this opinion, when, upon the trial of Oreſtes, he makes Diomede deliver his opinion in the public aſſembly.

† Fifty ſhips with Fifty men each; five bodies of 500 each. Il. ii. 168.

his

his judgment, avoids it. But there is a love of ſyſtem, and a fondneſs for an hypotheſis of one's own raiſing, to which an author inadvertently yields, with the blindneſs of a parent. It is this that warps the judgment from the ſtrait line of conſiſtency, and makes Mr. B. ſee thoſe facts in the authorities he appeals to, which no one can diſcover but himſelf.

It is on this ground that Mr. M. complains of unfairneſs in the citation from Varro and Juſtin Martyr, p. 4; and the miſrepreſentation of a paſſage from Thucydides, p. 19. It is with great juſtice alſo that he reprehends the adduction of a ſentence from Libanius, a ſophiſt of the fourth century, in oppoſition to the ancient hiſtorians; and ſupports this, not indeed by falſifying, but by ſuppreſſing the evidence of Herodotus. p. 19.

"*Mr. Bryant,*" *he ſays,* "*puts a little daſh where a part of the ſentence is omitted, but the reader ſhould be informed, that the ſentence runs thus: all beyond ſeemed full of danger, as they had little knowledge of thoſe parts* which appeared to be full of enemies."

This paſſage was cited to prove, that the Greeks never ſailed beyond Delos, becauſe the fleet of Sparta refuſed to proceed further upon a ſingle occaſion. Their want of knowledge therefore is enhanced; the fear of their enemies ſuppreſſed. But, in truth, what avails the knowledge of Sparta in this caſe? The argument ought to have proved the ignorance of the Greeks in general; and if they were ignorant of the ſea beyond Delos, how could the Æolian colony have been founded? Or, after it was founded, how could the intercourſe between Greece and her colonies have been preſerved, but by croſſing this ſea in every direction?

Another inſtance which ought not to be ſuppreſſed, is one which Mr. M. has reprehended with juſt indignation, but not half ſo much as it deſerves, p. 34. It is a paſſage from Diodorus (iv. 269) where the author ſays, that the Epigoni, after taking Thebes, conſecrated Daphne, daughter of Tireſias, prieſteſs of Delphi; ſhe was a verſifier of the oracles, and from her Homer

Homer borrowed many verſes to adorn his works. By this, ſays Mr. B. was not *originally* meant Thebes in Bœotia, but Θῆβαι Αἰγυπτίαι ἑκατόμπυλοι.—What? when the author ſays expreſsly, that it was *Thebes in Bœotia*, ſhall Mr. B. by his [*originally*] turn it into Thebes of Egypt; and ſhall his own unaccented Greek be put upon a careleſs reader, as if it were the expreſſion of Diodorus? Is it fair, is it candid to quote an author for what he does not write? or to turn what he does write, to prove an exact contradiction to what he means? And yet this is a reaſoner, who imputes prejudice to all who ſhall controvert his hypotheſis.

But we will proceed now in return to quote Bryant againſt Bryant. In the diſſertation before us, he maintains, p. 71,

"*That the chief objects of worſhip in this part of the world were Attis and Cybele, called Rhea Dindymene and Berecynthia, the mother of the Gods; ſhe was ſtyled* Θεὰ ἡ Φρυγία, *the Phrygian Goddeſs, and her prieſts, were the Corybantes, the ſame as the Idæi Dactyli and Curetes. But Homer makes Apollo the guardian God; and Minerva the chief Goddeſs, whoſe tutelary image was the Palladium.*"

But in his Analyſis of Ancient Mythology, vol. iii. p. 435, Mr. B. writes,

"*The Trojans and Myſians were of a different race from the native Phrygians, being of the ſame language with the people of Hellas and Ionia ... the Grecians and Trojans were of the ſame family, as ſpeaking the ſame language.*" *Morritt from Bryant, p.* 47.

Theſe two paſſages, in direct oppoſition to each other, cited from the ſame author, cannot, perhaps, be paralleled in point of contradiction, by any extracts from the moſt voluminous writer extant; and theſe two opinions Mr. B. delivered poſſibly at the ſame moment, for he aſſures us, that his diſſertation is no new work, it has been in preparation theſe thirty years.

Mr. M. with great juſtice, turns this contradiction to further advantage, by ſhowing, that Mr. B. not only once thought that the Trojans were of the ſame family with

with the Greeks, but alſo *that they exiſted*, which in his diſſertation he has thought fit to deny; and whenever Mr. M. ſhall bring his work to a ſecond edition, we hope he will not forget to remind Mr. B. that his Attis and Cybele were Phrygian deities and not Trojan; and that the Phrygia they belong to, is not on the coaſt of the Ægean Sea, not on the Helleſpont, but the great Phrygia* in the centre of Aſia Minor, and ſurrounded on all ſides by the maritime provinces. Peſſinus, from whence the Mater Berecynthia was brought to Rome, is not ſo little as 400 miles from Troy; and the city Cybele, ſuppoſed to be the ſame as Celænæ, is in its neighbourhood. If the provinces† on the coaſt worſhipped this deity, it was not a native, but imported ſuperſtition; and that, long after the age of Homer, when the Æolians and Ionians had admitted many of the Aſiatic ceremonies into their worſhip. The Diana of Epheſus was not the Greek Diana, but the Dea Multimamma, originally from Egypt.

It was our intention to cloſe what we had to ſay at preſent with this particular; but as our enquiry in the following number will be wholly confined to the geographical part of the controverſy, we ſhall here ſubjoin a few remarks on the country of Homer.

Mr. B. is decidedly of opinion, that Homer was of an Egyptian family; or, at leaſt, of an Ionian or Mileſian family ſettled in Egypt; and that he was born in Ithaca, but travelled himſelf alſo into Egypt, and there collected the Hiſtory of his Iliad, from the Egyptian Troy (Diſſert. p. 144); and firſt, he was of an Egyptian family, becauſe he was deſcended from Melanopus of Cyme, (Herod. vit. Hom. in initio.) and Melanopus ſignifies a *black* or *ſwarthy* countenance.—Aſking pardon for the levity of the remark, this is not a better proof, than if we were to apply it in a parallel

* It is to be obſerved, that Homer never calls the Trojans *Phrygians*, or their country *Phrygia*, however later authors may have confounded the two. In Homer, Phrygia is joined with Mæonia, and placed upon the Sangarius. in Ω. 545, the kingdom of Troy ſeems to be bounded on the Eaſt by Phrygia, on the North-weſt by the Helleſpont, and on the South by Leſbos.

† See Strabo, cited by Mr. B. p. 2.

manner,

manner, to prove that Edward the Black Prince was an Ethiopian; and little more do we think of Mr. B.'s Ægyptius Heros from the Odyſſey, as a proof that there were Egyptians in Ithaca, than if it were ſaid that all the family of the Frenches in England, are Frenchmen, or all the l'Anglois in France, Engliſhmen. After all that Mr. B. has ſaid himſelf, and all that he has caught from others, it will not be poſſible to ſhow from Homer himſelf, that he had any connection with Egypt, or that he ever was in the country. Reaſons for an opinion directly the reverſe, are numerous; for Homer himſelf proves his ignorance of Egypt, when he tells us, that a bird could not fly in a whole year† to the extent of Menelaus's wanderings in that country; an hyperbole undoubtedly, but ſtill an hyberbole that beſpeaks more ignorance than amplification. The Egyptian Thebes was evidently known to Homer by report; but he has carried Menelaus thither, without giving his courſe, in the ſame manner as he conveys Ulyſſes from the Æolian Iſlands to Ithaca and back again, without noticing the track that he purſued*.

It is a trite obſervation, that Homer was ignorant of the name of the river; and that he calls the Nile, Ægyptus. But even in this there is ſomething extraordinary; for whether the name be derived from the Hebrew, *Neel*, a river, or from the Ethiopic, *Nil*, blue, it is probably coeval with the inhabitants of the country. If Homer ever viſited Thebes, he muſt have paſſed by the Pyramids, and if the Egyptian Troy had been the real ſcene of his action, ſuppoſing it to be Babylon, or any place in the neighbourhood of Babylon, that city ſtood on the ſame rock where Cairo is now built; and the whole war muſt have paſſed in ſight of the Pyramids. Is this poſſible, without any alluſion to theſe maſſes? Or will it be argued, on the contrary, that Homer is prior to the Pyramids? The difficulties into which Mr. B. voluntarily plunges, in this part of his argument, are inexplicable; and if, as he ſays, there was no Troy in Aſia, but Ilium only, does it not follow, that he muſt annihilate

† Od. T. 322. * Od. K. 60.

Simois, Scamander, Tenedos, Samos, Leſbos, and all the places in the vicinity as well as Troy itſelf?

But Homer, if not an Egyptian was of an Egyptian family, and a native of Ithaca. Surely not. If Ithaca ſpoke the language of the continent to which it was attached, the language of Epirus was Doric; the Latins received their Language from this ſide of Greece which was neareſt to Italy, and the Latin language ſtill preſerves the Doric forms of inflexion without knowing any thing of the Ionic. But if Ithaca uſed the dialect of Epirus, that muſt be Doric alſo; and the dialect of Homer is as diſtinct from the Doric, as the Patois of Navarre is from the French of Paris.

If then Homer is neither an Egyptian nor a native of Ithaca, let us revert to Aſia Minor, where the general ſtream of tradition fixes his birth, and let us examine the circumſtances that tend to confirm this opinion. Smyrna, Chios, and Colophon all put in their claims; and Mr. Wood has, with great acuteneſs, obſerved, that the winds noticed by Homer and their effects, all conſpire to prove that he deſcribes what he ſaw; and that the characters of theſe winds all belong to the coaſt of Aſia, and to no other.

Ὡς δ' ἄνεμοι δύο πόντον ὀρίνετον ἰχθυόεντα,
Βορέης κὴ Ζέφυρος, τώτε Θρήκηθεν ἄητον. I. 5.

It is the north-weſt wind from Thrace that raiſes the ſtorm on the coaſt of Aſia, and it is the weſt, however it appears to be a rainy wind, in general, even in Homer, that is his freezing wind, and the Eaſt wind that thaws. See Od. T. 205. The effect of this wind on the coaſt of Aſia is ſtill the ſame, according to the evidence of Mr. Wood and other travellers who have obſerved it on the ſpot.

If then this be the country of Homer, let us next enquire for his city. The life of the poet, attributed to Herodotus, mentions Cyme as the place where his family lived, Smyrna as the place of his birth, and Chios of his reſidence; all theſe circumſtances are agreeable to the internal evidence of his works, and we are therefore rather diſpoſed to eſtabliſh than to controvert them. It is from the ſame authority alſo

we

we learn that he was an Æolian. The grand internal evidence to confirm this, is the dialect of the poems, now almoſt univerſally acknowledged to be a mixture of the Æolic and Ionic, and ſuch a mixture as the intercourſe of the tribes in their emigration might naturally produce.

The Æolian colony began to move about 60 years after the fall of Troy; Penthilus the ſon of Oreſtes conducted it to Thrace; his ſon Archelaus carried it over the Helleſpont to Cyzicum and Daſcylon. Graus*, ſon of Archelaus, advanced to the Granicus and Leſbos, while Cleuas† and Malaus, at the head of another party, built Cyme on the continent, between Leſbos and the gulf of Smyrna. Smyrna itſelf alſo was built by the Æolians 18 years after Cyme; and, as Cyme was the capital of Æolia, Smyrna was its boundary on the ſouth. But it is very remarkable that Smyrna was within the Ionian limit, lying ſouth of the Hermus; and what is ſtill more remarkable, the Ionians from Colophon and Epheſus took‡ Smyrna§ from the Æolians, and admitted it into the rights of their own league, and the Panionian aſſembly. This is a fact above all others which ſhould induce us to allow the pretenſions of Smyrna as the place which gave birth to Homer; the dialect of that city, more than any other which can be named, muſt be a mixture of the Æolic with the Ionic, and the Ionic as belonging to the prevailing power ought to be the prevailing idiom. This is the actual dialect of Homer, and this is what all the circumſtances connected imperiouſly require. But when we mention the Ionic dialect, it is not that of Herodotus, who wrote after the reſolution of the vowels had taken place, by which it is peculiarly diſtinguiſhed from the later Attic; but that ancient Ionic,

* Graus, ſon of Echelates, grandſon of Penthilus. Pauſan, 82.
† See Strabo, xiii. in initio.
‡ Pauſanias, 210.
§ There was a change in the ſite of Smyrna, noticed by the ancients, and marked by Pocock, vol. ii. book ii. p. 34. The new Smyrna was placed by Alexander, (Pauſan, 210) and for the honour of his ſagacity, it is almoſt the only harbour on the coaſt which is not choked.

which was the ſame as the Attic*, and which was the prevailing language of the Greeks, ſoftened, perhaps, originally from the Doric, and ſtill preſerving ſome of its peculiar forms.

Next to the dialect of Homer, we may notice thoſe expreſſions, which the author of his life ſays are Æolic. The πεμπώβολα, he informs us, are peculiar to the Æolians; the omiſſion of mentioning the Ὀσφύς in the ſacrifice is agreeable alſo to their manners; and the term Αἰσυμνῆτης, the title† of the chief magiſtrate in that country, is peculiar to Homer, or thoſe who have taken it from him. Theſe ſingularities, accompanied with the aſſertion, that the Æolians poſſeſſed the whole province of Troas‡, will, perhaps, raiſe our conjecture to a certainty, when we ſay that Homer was a native of Smyrna, and that the ſubject of his poem was naturally ſuggeſted by the ſite of Troy forming part of the poſſeſſions of his countrymen.

It does not from hence follow, that we aſſert the life of Homer to be genuine, or that it is the work of Herodotus; but we believe it to be very ancient, and to contain the current traditions concerning the poet. We can likewiſe ſay, that it does not neceſſarily imply an anachroniſm, when it places his age 622 years previous to the expedition of Xerxes, as the Æolian emigration is ſtill prior to that date. The marbles indeed fix the age of Homer 196 years later; and the ſyſtem we have adopted would make it poſterior to the Ionian colony; but in all that has been ſaid on this point, we have not the preſumption to talk of proofs. We wiſh only to reconcile difficulties, and compare the internal evidence with the traditions: in the performance of this taſk, we truſt that we have been employed in the cauſe of literature, and given teſtimony of our veneration of the poet. Τὰ Ὁμήρου γὰρ ὠφέλιμα ἐγένετο ἐς ἅπαντα ἀνθρώποις. Pauſ. Meſ. 139. and we will

* τὴν μὲν Ἰάδα τῇ παλαιᾷ Ατθίδι τὴν αὐτὴν φαμὲν. Strabo viii. 333.

† See Apollonius in voce. Etym. Mag. Bentley Hom. from Ariſtotle.

‡ Αἰολέων οἱ Ἴλιον ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἔχοντες. Pauſ.

now

now for the preſent conclude with a ſentiment, to which we hope Mr. Bryant himſelf will ſubſcribe.

In an age when it is the faſhion to deſtroy every thing and build nothing, if half the talents and erudition which are applied to ſupport the dreams of ſcepticiſm, were employed in confirming the received opinions of mankind, the ſcience of criticiſm, as well as politics, would be benefited by the exchange.

MARCH 1.

Geography of Homer.

The geographical accuracy of Homer is ſo generally acknowledged by all writers, ancient and modern, that it ſtands in no need of confirmation. By taking a collective view of both his poems, we have the coaſt from Corcyra to Theſſaly, and again from Thrace to Rhodes, with the iſlands of the Ægean Sea, and the interior of Greece, traced with ſo much preciſion, as to form a baſis for every local reſearch, from the time of Strabo to the preſent hour. Within theſe limits, the knowledge of the poet ſeems to be complete; and if he is miſtaken when he ſpeaks of Libya, Egypt, Phœnicia, or Italy, it is becauſe his countrymen, in the age wherein he lived, knew little beyond this boundary, but from report. It is however, in direct oppoſition to this pre-eminence, ſo univerſally acknowledged, that Mr. Bryant has affirmed, that Homer was ignorant of the very country in which he lived*; that the ſcene of the Iliad does not correſpond with the local circumſtances of the Troad; that no ſuch city as Troy exiſted in the leſſer Phrygia; that the real Troy was in Egypt; and that, if it muſt be brought into Aſia, it muſt be placed at Lectum on the Ægean Sea, and not on the Helleſpont.

Againſt an hypotheſis ſo viſionary, ſo inconſiſtent even with the fictions of poetry, and ſo peculiarly foreign to the character of Homer, and the tenor of his poems, it is not ſtrange if the whole circle of the literary world is united. Since the late viſits which have been made to that country, the arguments muſt be

* ἀμπείρῳ καὶ ἀντοπίῳ. Strab. p. 603.

directed againſt evidence upon matter of fact; and as a reſpectable Alderman in the Houſe of Commons made no other anſwer to a charge of peculation, than "prove it," ſo we reply generally to Mr. B. that, with all due reſpect to his abilities, and the fulleſt acknowledgement of his erudition, we deny his proofs.

If the evidence of M. Chevalier ſtood ſingly upon his own aſſertion, it would ſtill be entitled to the ſame degree of credit which all other human evidence claims, where there is no ſuſpicion of corrupt influence or colluſion; but ſince Mr. Morritt has reviſited the Troad, and confirmed all the eſſential circumſtances of M. Chevalier's deſcription, and thoſe circumſtances correſpond in all their peculiarities with the delineation of Homer; either Mr. Bryant muſt ſubmit to this teſtimony, or he muſt maintain that Mr. Morritt, with all the Engliſh* gentlemen who have been upon the ſame ſpot, have conſpired with Mr. Chevalier to ſupport a falſehood. The ſame falſehood muſt likewiſe have been propagated eighteen hundred years ago by Strabo, who declares, that the face of the whole country is in correſpondence with the deſcriptions of the Iliad, and that the features are marked too ſtrongly to be miſtaken. The conſiſtency of theſe aſſertions is now to be conſidered; and if the general picture in both is the ſame, we may juſtly conclude, that the minuter particulars had not varied more in the nine centuries between Homer and Strabo, than in the eighteen between Strabo and the preſent day.

The conformity of this picture is ſo exact, that if Mr. Morritt's plan of the Troad were now engraved without the names of places, it would anſwer generally as well for the deſcription of Strabo, as of Mr. Morritt himſelf and M. Chevalier. Without names we ſay, becauſe Strabo differs from them eſſentially in names only. But he has the ſame three rivers, the ſame Ida, the ſame plain, the ſame hollows in which the rivers flow, the ſame heights running eaſt of the central river, the ſame cliff on the coaſt, the ſame flat and marſhy

* Meſſrs. Dallaway, Stockdale, Hawkins, Sibthorpe, Liſton, Berners.

fall

fall of the coaſt towards the Helleſpont*. His Rheteum and Sigeum likewiſe agree, and the ſeveral tumuli or barrows are ſtill viſible.

The grand error of Strabo is, that he has tranſmuted the names of the Simois and Scamander; but all authorities, ancient and modern, agree in aſſigning the title of Scamander to the mouth of the three ſtreams after they are united; and the miſtake is, that in tracing theſe ſtreams upwards from the fork, Strabo called the central ſtream† Scamander, and the weſtern ſtream Simois. The rectifying of this miſtake is the diſcovery of M. Chevalier; and a ſtill greater diſcovery is the reſtoring of the true Scamander, which was loſt out of our maps, becauſe its courſe had been turned, and becauſe it no longer joined the Simois, but iſſued by a canal into the Ægean Sea, inſtead of the Helleſpont. That this is a fact, and no hypotheſis, may be ſeen by conſulting Mr. d'Anville's Map of Aſia Minor and Syria, and M. de la Rochette's Map of the Propontis. Two higher authorities there are not; and in d'Anville, no trace of Chevalier's Scamander will be found, nor any iſſue of a ſtream into the Ægean. In de la Rochette's map, the brook appears as it was taken from Wood, reduced in its courſe by half, and unknown to him for the Scamander, as it was to Mr. Wood whom he followed. In de la Rochette likewiſe will be ſeen the vain reſearches of Chandler and Wood, to find a Simois and Scamander; and that they were both wandering in the heights of Ida to find a ſite for Troy, although Homer declares it was built in the plain.

ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλισο πόλις. Υ. 217.

The error of Strabo, in tranſmuting the names of the rivers, is marked much more ſtrongly by Chevalier than by Morritt‡; and it can never be marked in

* "Thus far Strabo could not have been more exact, though the map had been before his eyes." Chev. p. 63.

† Strabo compares the courſe of the two ſtreams to their confluence, to the letter Υ; but this is applicable to the fork of any two rivers.

‡ Morritt, p. 113, ſays, Strabo *ſeems* as if he conſidered the leſſer ſtream as Simois.

terms

terms too positive; because all the wanderings of modern travellers depend upon it. His words are these:

Οἱ δὲ ποταμοὶ ὅ, τε Σκάμανδρος, καὶ ὁ Σιμόεις, ὁ μὲν τῷ Σιγείῳ πλησιάσας, ὁ δὲ τῷ Ροιτείῳ, μικρὸν ἔμπροσθεν τῆς Ιλίου συμβάλλουσιν, εἶτ' ἐπὶ τὸ Σιγείον ἐκδιδόασι. (P. 597. Ed. Cas.)

"*These two rivers, the Scamander and the Simois, the latter approaching* [*the coast on*] *the Sigean side, the former on the Rhetean, unite in the front* of* [*modern*] *Ilium, at a small distance from the city, and fall into the sea at* [*or near*] *Sigeum.*"

If the rendering of ὁ μὲν and ὁ δὲ, in this passage, should be doubted, it may be confirmed by observing, that in the same page it is said, "the Scamander rises from Cotylus, and divides the tract called Cebrenia from the territory of Scepsis;" and it is added, in another passage, that the Andrius falls into this Scamander: consequently, a reference to the map will immediately show, that this Scamander is the Simois of Chevalier. That Chevalier is right, will be proved hereafter; but we must now advert to another particular in this passage. "The rivers join *in front* of new Ilium, and fall into the sea at Sigeum." It were to be wished, that some of these travellers had fixed the site of new Ilium, and explained the term ἔμπροσθεν, which Chevalier renders *in front*. But in this there is no precision; and we may still ask, if Ilium was above the junction or below it? Mr. Morritt says, no trace of it is left; and Chevalier places it in his map below the junction, on the western bank. But we beg leave to propose a conjecture to the travellers who have visited the spot, whether it might not be placed just *above* the junction, where Mr. Wood places one of his ruined bridges; and where we may suppose the road from Abydus to Alexandria crossed the river, which must be either at this bridge, or at the other below the junction.

* Professor Heyne seems to doubt whether Homer expressly makes the two rivers join; but in the Book E. Lin. 774, it is noticed in direct terms, and remarked upon by Pope.

Another

Another remark ought to be made, which is, that in this paſſage Strabo brings the united ſtream into the ſea at Sigeum; whereas, in Mr. Morritt's plan, it is nearer Rheteum; and in Chevalier's centrical. Has the river changed its courſe and its iſſue? Or did Strabo, knowing that the troops muſt paſs the Scamander, in their route to the field of battle, change it for that purpoſe? If he *did* change it, it could not anſwer his deſign, for the field was

Μεσσηγὺς Σιμόεντος ἰδὲ Ξάνθοιο ῥοάων. Z. 4.

Theſe queſtions are not propoſed for the purpoſe of creating difficulties, or of implicating Strabo in all the obſcurity and perplexity ſo liberally imputed to him by his commentators; but for the ſake of allowing weight to an argument of Mr. Bryant's, which he adduces with great triumph. Strabo does labour under doubts and confeſſes them. They are the ſame as Mr. Wood felt*, and proceeded from the ſame cauſe. Both had aſſumed the wrong river for the Scamander, and neither of them could make it agree with Homer. Is there any thing ſurpriſing in this? Chevalier has diſcovered the true Scamander, and Homer is conſiſtent.

Shall it be ſaid then, that Demetrius, who lived at Scepſis, did not know the name of the river that waſhed the walls of his own city? That the Scepſians did not know the Simois from the Scamander? Yes. Strabo, who copies Demetrius, doubts his authority†; he ſays, p. 602, that his Scamander has but one ſpring; whereas, Homer's ought to have two, and that the warm ſpring has vaniſhed. On this ignorance of a native, Mr. B. grounds a general accuſation. They applied Homer's names, he ſays, to places they found in the country, and they would not correſpond after they

* See Wood, 324, 329, &c.

† Strabo is too much condemned for following Demetrius. He does not copy him from the beginning of the xiiith book to p. 597; and then, though he cites his authority, he doubts it. The whole line of coaſt is perſpicuous, and ſeems to be Strabo's; the error is in names.

were

were applied. They could find no Troy, but an Ilium only, nay, not even the ruins of Troy,

Etiam periere ruinæ.

Hence he concludes there never was a Troy in the country. This is an argument of great appearance, and is confirmed by Strabo's account of the Scepſians, who did not know their own river; and by a confeſſion of the ſame author, who gives up Alybe and the ſilver mines to this ſort of fiction, with Allazonium and ſome others (p. 603).

We give this argument its full weight, and now let us ſee to what it amounts. It proves that the inhabitants of the Troad were ignorant; but it does not prove either the ignorance or the fiction of Homer. If Homer lived 622 years before the expedition of Xerxes, as the author of his life aſſerts, this date makes him write 22 years after the migration of the Æolian colony, and 82 years after the taking of Troy. If he lived at the period the chronologers fix, in 907, Ant. C. it brings him within 277 years of the ſame period; or if he lived, according to our conjecture, ſoon after the Ionian migration, in 1044, we may ſtill place him within 150 years of the war he deſcribes. Is this a diſtance of time ſufficient to obliterate all the particulars of the war, and all the local circumſtances of the country? In reſpect to an author too ἀμπείρῳ καὶ ἀτοπίῳ, as Strabo calls him (p. 603). If we had no hiſtory of our own country, would not the teſtimony of the neighbouring inhabitants point out to us the fields of Naſeby, Marſton Moor, Boſworth, and Haſtings? No, ſays Mr. B. the Scepſians knew nothing of all this, they could not tell the very ſite of Troy; neither has Demetrius or Strabo fixed it. To this we anſwer, that the Italians do not know where to place Falernum, nor the French Gergovia*; and yet it is univerſally believed that both exiſted; that Falernum produced good wine, and that Cæſar was compelled to raiſe the ſiege of Gergovia. If the poſition of theſe places is now loſt, it does not follow that it was loſt

* See d'Anville, Notice de la Gaule, p. 349.

within

within 150 years after the age of Julius Cæsar. The ruins of both have perished, as well as those of Troy, Tyre, Memphis, Palibothra, and an hundred more (Morritt. p. 100).

Let us suppose that the places now pointed out to the Pilgrims, in the Holy Land, for the transactions recorded in the Gospel are ideal; does it prove that there were no such transactions †? But Alybe and Allazonium are fictions acknowledged by Strabo. That may be, and yet an Alybe might still exist in Homer's age. Consult the Roman Itineraries, and particularly Shaw's commentary on those of Africa. How many places have totally disappeared? How many has that author fixed from circumstances or conjecture? But, if his conjectures are erroneous, still the existence of the places themselves is not doubted. We shall speak more on the site of Troy and its ruins, when we treat of Mr. Morritt's view of the country; but at present, after reasserting the general fidelity of Strabo's picture, we shall briefly examine Pliny and Ptolemy.

Pliny.

The whole passage of Pliny * is adduced by Mr. Morritt, p. 112; and, short as it is, conveys some curious particulars. His account ranges up the Ægean, from Alexandria Troas, the Eski Stamboul of the Turks; and he mentions, in the following order, Nee (the Νία κώμη of Strabo) the Scamander, a navigable river; Sigeum, at the Cape of the same name; the harbour of the Greeks, which receives Xanthus, after being joined by the Simois; and the Palæ-Scamander, after it has first formed a lake. This series, like many others of Pliny, is confused, but yet taken from good authority. We have here three Scamanders; one that falls into the Ægean, and afterwards Xanthus and Palæ-Scamander, both the same as the first, and both falling with the Simois into the *Greek harbour*. But we have likewise a fact, of which both Chevalier and Mor-

† See Maundrell, who says they have a grotto for every transaction recorded.

* Plin. lib. v. c. 33.

ritt

ritt avail themſelves, to prove that the diverſion of the Scamander from its natural courſe, into the channel it now occupies, is as old as Pliny, and that the trace of its ancient bed, which carried it into the Simois, was not loſt; under this title, it was known as Palæ, or the old Scamander. This is an evidence of high importance, and we muſt leave the commentators of Pliny to diſpoſe of his Xanthus as well as circumſtances will permit; or to change it into the Thymbrius, the only† other river which iſſues at the ſame mouth.

The turning of the Scamander, though not known under that name to Mr. Wood, is imputed by him to a Turkiſh governor; but it is probable, that the nature‡ of the ground afforded the means, and convenience prompted the execution of the work, before the age of Pliny. It ſhortened the tranſport from New Ilium to the Ægean ſea, and it ſaved the doubling of a Cape; both reaſons ſufficient, in the view of a Greek or a Roman, to incur the expence of ſuch an undertaking. That Mr. Wood ſhould acknowledge this change in the channel, and not trace it; that the idea of its being the Scamander of Homer ſhould never occur; or that he ſhould aſcend Ida to find a plain, where there was no plain, can only be accounted for by his following the Scamander of Strabo. Yet, even with this ground for his miſtake, he ought to have looked for a Simois on the weſt, and he has placed his on the eaſt. If Mr. Bryant's eſſay was written thirty years ago, it is not ſtrange that he ſhould labour under ſimilar difficulties, or declare that the geography of the Troad did not correſpond with Homer.

Ptolemy.

The account of Ptolemy is reverſed; he comes down the Helleſpont from Abydus, next to which he places

† The only river in the plain; there are ſeveral currents which join the Simois in the mountains.

‡ Morritt's and Chevalier's plan differ on this point; Morritt carries the cliff further to the ſouth than the iſſue; Chevalier makes the cliff ſubſide before it comes to the iſſue, and places the mouth on low ground. It is of ſome conſequence to have this aſcertained; becauſe, if the coaſt was a cliff at the iſſue, it muſt have been cut through to allow of a channel.

the

the mouth of the Simois, then Dardanum*, Scamander, Sigeum, without any mention of Rheteum; but the river between Abydus and Dardanum would be the Rhodius, not the Simois; and it is not for the purpose of noticing this error that his series is introduced, but to show that he is in correspondence with Pliny and Strabo, in placing the mouth of the true Scamander immediately previous to Sigeum.

M. Chevalier.

After clearing all these difficulties, which arise from the errors of the ancient geographers, we come now to the DISCOVERY of M. Chevalier; and we have no hesitation to give his reseaches this title, when we find the whole scenery of the Iliad verified upon the spot, and every transaction capable of being assigned to its proper place. Mr. Morritt's testimony upon this head, and that of his fellow travellers, is so honourable to the author of it, that if there still remain any sceptic upon the question, we should hold ourselves not bound to admit any doubts of speculation, nor any that could be made, except from another visit to the country, and a contradiction of the facts as stated by these highly respected and meritorious travellers. We profess a perfect belief in the evidence before us; and we likewise believe, that the method of the illustrious d'Anville, in acquiring a knowledge of ancient geography, by a faithful survey of the present state of any country, is the only true and legitimate way of arriving at geographical truth. It is highly probable, that no fiction, poetical or historical, would stand the test of a comparison of this nature; and whenever a narrative of any sort will stand the test, the chance is greatly in its favour that it is not a fiction, but a reality.

The leading feature for determining M. Chevalier's Scamander to be the true Scamander of Homer, is, that it must be on the left of the Trojan army†, when

* Mr. Morritt, p. 90, is not correct in his statement; he places Dardanum previous to Simois; but he is misled by Mr. Bryant, p. 31.

† See Chevalier, p. 68.

drawn up on the field of battle; but as this is controverted by Mr. Bryant (p. 31. Obſervations) and defended by Mr. Morritt, p. 90, we ſhall inveſtigate the queſtion with all the attention it deſerves. Mr. B.'s ſtatement, as appears by the concluſion of the ſection, depends upon a ſyſtem he has adopted, of carrying the ſcene of action from the Helleſpont to the coaſt of the Ægean, towards Alexandria (a ſyſtem we ſhall conſider under the following head) and conſequently he aſſumes Pliny's new mouth of the Scamander, between Sigeum and Alexandria, for his Scamander. In this he is peculiarly unfortunate; for then, either his Scamander muſt be the ſame as Chevalier's, or elſe the Greeks could not paſs that river in their route to the field of battle. This is a dilemma which his hypotheſis can never obviate; for, he adds, that the left of the Greek army lay cloſe upon this river*. Trace this river, or canal rather, up to its old junction, and unite it with Strabo's Scamander (the real Simois) or follow it up to Bounar-bachi, and you will find that Troy is open, and no Scamander of Strabo's is to be paſſed at all. This ſyſtem is directly contrary to Homer in all its parts.

But let us next place ourſelves on the plain at Bounar-bachi; let us look down the plain towards the Helleſpont with Chevalier; let us march down with Hector towards the Grecian camp, between Sigeum and Rheteum, and we have immediately Chevalier's Scamander on the *left*, as we ought to have,

μάχης ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ πάσης. A. 498.

In anſwer to this, Mr. B. has a variety of quotations, to ſhow that Ajax was encamped on the *left* of the Greek army, and fought on the *left*. But does not Mr. B. perceive, that the *left* of two oppoſite armies is exactly the moſt diſtant point of their two lines, and that the *left* of the Trojans muſt be oppoſed to the *right* of the Greeks? Εἵσατο γὰρ ΝΗΩΝ ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ. M. 115, is the *left* of the Greeks, not of the Trojans

* Conſult Mr. B.'s Map, Differt. 155, and it will appear that there is nothing but an ideal river, of his own making, between *his* Palæ Scamander and *his* Troy.

Hector

Hector was on the *left* of the Trojans, near the Scamander, and therefore heard nothing of the ſlaughter Ajax was making on the *right* of the Trojans, where he ſlew Doryclus, Pandocus, Lyſander, Pyraſus, and Pylartus, Lin. 490. It was not till Cebriones intimated this deſtruction to Hector (Lin. 521) that he removed to the right of his own line, and ſtood oppoſite to Ajax, who fought on the left of the Greeks. Here the battle continued, till, after a variety of intermediate circumſtances, the ſhip of Proteſilaus was fired, which was on the left, as well as Ajax's. N. 681. The courſe of Hector's chariot is marked, which proves diſtance and change of poſition; and if Mr. Bryant will read the whole paſſage in A, from the 465th to the 542d line, once more, he will find that his own Scamander, and his own poſition of the armies, are totally inexplicable; while the plan of Chevalier and Morritt is conſiſtent with itſelf in all its parts, and with Homer.

It is with great pleaſure we have, while preparing this article, received the laſt volume of the Tranſactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, in which Profeſſor Dalzell* has reſumed this ſubject, and indulged us with a memoir of Profeſſor Heyne, who has, without heſitation, admitted the whole of Chevalier's ſyſtem, acknowledging, with the true liberality of a man of ſcience, the correction of his own ideas, and the difficulties he had in vain attempted to unravel in a former treatiſe. Far from thinking it incumbent on him to ſupport his own aſſertions, like Mr. B. becauſe he had made them many years ago, he hails the diſcovery, and feels an additional ſatisfaction in ſeeing the poet delivered from the only charge of inconſiſtency which could affect his reputation. The writer of this article ſympathizes in this feeling: he had been conſulted in drawing up a map of the Troad, and labouring under the ſame perplexity, had declared all former attempts, from Strabo downwards, inapplicable to the Iliad; he adviſed the publiſher therefore to ſtate the various ideas of the ſeveral travellers, leaving each accountable for his own ſuggeſtions. It is not neceſſary

* The piece is entitled, Tableau de la Plaine de Troy.

to enter into the detail of Profeſſor Heyne, which may be ſeen to more advantage in his own diſſertation; but if any man of learning ſhould, after the peruſal of it, ſtill adhere to the old ſyſtem, we muſt leave him to the ſuggeſtions of his own mind,

Quis enim invitum ſervare laboret?

We have already ſaid, that the picture of M. Chevalier is the ſame as Strabo's, in character, though not in name; and, if we take our view from the top of the plain, with the two rivers, one on each ſide, their junction, the poſition of Thymbra, the barrows, the flat ſhore of the Helleſpont, &c. &c. the reſemblance cannot be denied. What, if he has committed ſome errors? He has atoned for them by a liberal confeſſion; and Profeſſor Dalzell has acted as ingenuouſly, in regard to his ſhare in the work*. But whether we are to read *Dios-tape* or *Duo-tape*, is too immaterial to affect the main queſtion†. Still leſs do we regard the miſtake about the tomb of Ilus, and the Θρωσμὸς πεδίοιο; but the tumuli of Achilles, Patroclus, and Ajax, exiſt where Strabo ſaw them, and where, according to Homer and tradition, they ought to be. Theſe, however, are *Thracian*, ſays Mr. B. They may be; but they are ſtill evidence for Strabo: and if that of Achilles is where the poet placed his quarters, and that of Ajax correſpondent, it forms a high preſumptive proof, that the tradition in Strabo's time was genuine. It naturally occurs to a lover of Homer, that the poet paints the very ſcenery which he had obſerved, when he ſo beautifully deſcribes it, H. 86; that he was really ſailing on the Helleſpont, and viewed with veneration the memorial of his heroes.

Mr. Bryant.

We come now to the boldeſt flight of imagination which the ſoaring ſpirit of Mr. B. has taken, for ſuch a fiction as his map of the Troad (Diſſert. p. 155) does

* See P. Dalzell's Tableau. Append. p. 119.
† *Dheo Tape* in Liſton. Tableau.

not

not appear to have been attempted in any former inſtance. It would ſuit the wanderings of Io in the Prometheus, or the travels of Philóſtratus, as well as Homer. If Mr. B. will place Troy in Egypt, let him keep it there, and find out localities to ſuit it; but after going to Egypt, do not let him return to Aſia Minor, or make the poet guilty of two deceptions inſtead of one. The whole of this hypotheſis reſts upon a ſingle epithet of Homer, who calls the Helleſpont *broad*, while it is in reality a ſtrait. But, as Mr. M. (p. 80) very juſtly obſerves, every other epithet implies a current; and may not a *narrow* ſea be a *wide* ſtream? Is not the paſſage of the Dardanelles as truly ἀγάῤῥοος at this hour, as Homer deſcribes it? We will add, for Mr. B.'s information, that after this ſtream iſſues from the ſtrait, and ſpreads itſelf into the Ægean Sea, the current becomes gradually imperceptible; and that it is incumbent upon him to ſhow, that when it reaches Lectum it is *impetuous*, or elſe his whole ſyſtem is without even the ſhadow of a baſis. Virgil* certainly thought, that the epithet of *broad* might be applied to a ſtrait,

Sigea igni freta *lata* relucent. 11. 312.

and though it may be a ſoleciſm to render this a *broad narrow* ſea, we might perhaps admit the expreſſion of a *broad* ſtrait. But if there be a ſingle author, from the age of Homer to the preſent day, except Mr. B. who ever doubted of the ſituation of the Helleſpont, who ever placed it in the Ægean or at Lectum, we are ready to retract. What, after all, is the name of any place, if it be not that which the natives give it?

Another ſource of Mr. B.'s error is, as Mr. M. remarks, his confounding Lectum with Gargarus; but, in the common acceptation of all geographers, Lectum is the termination of the ridge of Ida on the ſouth, and Gargarus is the ſummit, not far from the centre. If Mr. B. will follow the courſe of Juno, Ξ 225, through one of thoſe aerial expeditions of the Gods, which

* Morritt, p. 80.

Homer deſcribes with as much attention to geography as thoſe of mortals,

Ὁσσά τε γαῖαν ἐπιπνείει τε καὶ ἔρπει,

he will ſee how perfectly the poet has diſtinguiſhed Gargarus from Lectum. Juno bounds from Olympus to Pieria, and thence by Emathia, Thrace, and Athos, to Lemnos. At Lemnos ſhe finds SLEEP, and perſuades that God to accompany her; and here a new route commences; they leave Imbros and Lemnos, and approach Ida, that part of Ida called Lectum. Ξ. 284. At Lectum the poet expreſſly makes Sleep remain, while Juno proceeds to Gargarus.

Ἔνθ' Ὕπνος μὲν ἔμεινε....
Ἥρη δὲ κραιπνῶς προσιεβήσατο Γάργαρον ἄκρον
Ἴδης ὑψηλῆς.

If this does not imply diſtinction and diſtance, then is the poet incapable of expreſſing himſelf diſtinctly. If Mr. B. aſks why this circuitous flight, when they might have gone ſtrait from Lemnos; the anſwer is not very conſiſtent with our notions of a deity, but with Homer's uſual picture of his Jupiter. Jupiter was now looking on the plain of Troy, and they approached him from behind: and Jupiter was not a Janus, as we learn from Il. N. init. He could not look North to the Danube, and Weſt to the Plain, at the ſame time. Let us aſk Mr. B. in return, why he wiſhes to confound Gargarus with Lectum? Is it not, that he may remove the God juſt ſo much further from the ſcene of action as the diſtance is between thoſe two ſummits? Mr. Morritt aſſures us, that, from Gargarus, the plain, the ſhips, the Helleſpont, and Tenedos, are all in ſight. It is this reaſon which induces the poet to fix his Jupiter on that ſummit, and becauſe the ſame places are not all viſible from Lectum*, Mr. B. wiſhes to fix him there.

* It may be for the ſame reaſon Mr. B. places Tenedos in his map oppoſite to Lectum, which is in reality near midway between that Cape and Sigeum.

Next

Next to the confuſion of mountains, is the invention of rivers. Fortunately for geographers, ſome features of the earth are perpetual. Rivers flow, mountains riſe, and capes project, where they did thirty centuries ago. Now d'Anville could find no river at Lectum, nor Morritt, nor any traveller whoſe work we can conſult. But Mr. B. can find two, and can give a courſe of twenty* miles to one of them. It is very ſtrange, that theſe rivers ſhould have eſcaped all notice by ancients and moderns, and that Mr. B. ſhould order us to go and look for them till we find them. Mr. Morritt however informs him, that there is no ſtream from Alexandria Troas to Lectum, which can have a longer courſe than from the ridge to the ſea; that the margin of the coaſt is very narrow; that there is nothing larger than a brook: and, we will add, that there is no river on the coaſt of Aſia Minor from Trapezus to Iſſus, with a courſe of twenty miles, or ten, or five, which is not noticed by the ancient† geographers, and diſcoverable by the moderns. Yet, ſuppoſe ſuch a river, or rivers, to be found, Mr. B. muſt next find a plain for his rivers: and a Thymbra, and tumuli, and a marſh. Not one of theſe features are now at Lectum [C. Baba] and yet Homer and his Iliad muſt be tranſported firſt to Egypt, and then back again to Lectum. Laſt of all, Mr. B. (Diſſert. p. 169) recommends us to look for Troy to the Eaſt of the ruins at Eſki Stamboul, or Alexandria. To what purpoſe? If we find it there, it would not be Mr. B.'s Troy, but another; and when he adds, *that the names of places, though liable to ſome alteration, yet ſurvive for ages, and if any tradition of ſuch a city remains, it is to be ſought for here*, we imagine he makes a conceſſion in favour of all his opponents. They *have* a tradition; they *have* names of places, ſomewhat altered, but ſurviving. All theſe concur on the Helleſpont; and travellers will not follow either Mr. B. or

* This muſt be collected from his map, which has neither ſcale or degree, by compariſon. The real diſtance from Sigeum to Lectum is about 30 miles. Compare Mr. B.'s river with this diſtance on the map.

† We can ſay nothing on Mr. Wood's map, in Mr. B.'s poſſeſſion, as it is not before the public. See Diſſert. p. 166.

Mr.

Mr. Wood into the mountains, ſo long as theſe traditions are conſiſtent with the rivers, the coaſt, and the only plain of twelve miles in extent, between Abydus and Lectum.

It is an eaſy method, and not a new one, to frame a geography, or topography, to an author; but when an editor does this, he warns us of the fiction. Clarke gives an Alexandria, or an Aleſia, to explain the text of Cæſar, but he never impoſes theſe plans upon us for realities. This caution does not ſuit Mr. B. He firſt tells us there never was a Troy in Phrygia; he next gives us a plan of one from his own imagination; and, finally, he ſends us to ſeek for another above Alexandria; not conſidering that his third is incompatible with his firſt, and that if we find a Troy in Phrygia, he muſt have recourſe to another ſyſtem.

Mr. Morritt.

It is our duty to conclude this diſquiſition with our acknowledgments to Mr. Morritt, for the part he has taken in this controverſy; and if, in what has been ſaid, we have had a view rather to the whole queſtion than to the particular ſhare of it contained in his work, ſtill it has been our intention to bring forward his arguments upon every occaſion, and to confirm the juſtneſs of his reaſoning by our own remarks. By this method, we have given him, we conceive, a greater teſtimony of our reſpect than could have been done by confining ourſelves to partial extracts, or to the order of his text. We now proceed to conſider the merit of his reſearches, the aid he affords to the elucidation of the poet, and the evidence he gives in favour of M. Chevalier. Much merit will doubtleſs be allowed to men of affluent fortune, who employ their time and labour in the inveſtigation of truth; for truth, even in regard to objects of curioſity, is ſtill the firſt of gratifications to an enlightened mind. But all that concerns Homer is above ordinary curioſity; and we receive as much pleaſure in ſeeing the ſcene of the Iliad identified with the actual ſtate of the country, as we experience in viewing the battle of Salamis, as deſcribed by Herodotus, verified by a ſurvey of the ſpot, and explained by the commentary

mentary of Bartelemi. We have already ſaid, that the picture of the Plain of Troy is the ſame as to its general features in Strabo, and our modern travellers; and when it is conſidered that there is no plain of ten miles in length, and three in breadth, throughout the whole Troad, except this; no plain, where two armies of the given magnitude could be drawn up, except this; it is juſt to conclude, that this ſpot is aſſumed with truth as the baſis of our enquiry. The parts are next to be examined; and here, if we allow the Scamander of Chevalier to be truly aſſumed, all the circumſtances of the Iliad are in harmony with the face of the country at the preſent moment. Mr. B. denies his aſſent to this aſſumption. Mr. Morritt reaſſumes the ſurvey with Homer and Chevalier in his hand, and declares his full acquieſcence in the fidelity of Chevalier's picture of the country; he confirms alſo, in terms the moſt ſtrong and direct, that fact upon which all his reaſoning ſtands, the change of the courſe and the bed of the Scamander. If this were a blind acquieſcence in authority, it might be liable to animadverſion: but it is a critical ſurvey, agreeing on the whole, but varying in particulars. This is the teſt of a prudent and well-founded judgment. General approbation conveys nothing preciſe; "ita enim cætera tibi placere credam, ſi quædam diſplicuiſſe ſenſero," ſays Pliny. It is in conſequence of ſuch an examination, that we ſaw with pleaſure Mr. M.'s diſſent from Chevalier on the ſite of Troy. We never approved of C.'s carrying the walls back to the edge of the precipice, or encloſing the tomb of Hector within them. It appears manifeſtly, from the laſt book of the Iliad, that if Hector had been to be buried within the walls, the requeſt of Priam to Achilles would have been ſuperfluous. (See lin. 660). But in Mr. M.'s diſſent on this point, we find a confirmation of another; we find a tumulus covered with ſtones, and we read (Il. Ω. 798) that the tomb of Hector was raiſed with ſtones, whereas that of Patroclus conſiſted only of earth heaped up. (Ψ. 226) The queſtion indeed does not reſt on this; neither is it neceſſary to contend with Mr. Bryant, whether the barrows now viſible on the ſpot are Trojan or Thracian: but

but when there are two found on Sigeum, where thoſe of Achilles and Patroclus ought to be, when the Aianteum is where that of Ajax ought to be, and theſe names were aſſigned to them 2000 years ago; when that attributed to Hector is found to this hour ſtrewed with looſe ſtones, (ſee the View, Mor. p. 106) and all the others are mounds of earth, ſurely this is ſome teſtimony in their favour; and when Mr. M. adds, that he ſtill found the ſame barrows every where in Greece, in the ſame places where Pauſanias mentions their exiſtence in his time, it gives a further corroboration of the traditions annexed to all. Little doubt can be made of the exiſtence of barrows in Thrace; they are common almoſt to the whole world. Leſs doubt is there of the Thracians paſſing into Aſia; as there were Thyni, Bithyni, Mœſi, or Muſi, in both countries. But before Mr. B. can prove the barrows in the Troad to be Thracian, he ought to prove the age of the migration, and a tradition attached to it. Till that ſhall be done, our tradition is better than his, by a preſcriptive right of 2000 years ſtanding.

The ſite of Troy is not aſcertained, either by Chevalier or Morrit, further than from conjecture. Mr. M. has marked ſomething like foundations in his view of Bounar-bachi (p. 92); but he does not appear to lay much ſtreſs on them, nor was he allowed to dig. Neither would it be a proof that they were Trojan, if found, unleſs they were of that maſſy form which characterizes the buildings of the mythological age, or of that diamond pattern, which Mr. M. calls Cyclopian. To one or other of theſe periods, the building of Troy, as being the work of Apollo, muſt certainly be referred; and if the Curetes and Cyclopes be the ſame, as Mr. Bryant ſuppoſes, they were ſeated at one period in Phrygia Minor. We do not wiſh to detract from the merit of the Diſcovery, by calling the poſition aſſigned by theſe gentlemen conjectural, for it has every appearance of approaching to reality; but it is ſtill to be obſerved, that Chevalier's eſtimate of the diſtance from the coaſt to the city, is twelve miles, reduced to ten by Mr. M. and to eight by Mr. Dallaway, who takes in the ſpace of the camp, &c. &c. and, laſt of all, if we refer to Mr. Wood, it is ſhort of ſix Italian miles

miles from Bounar-bachi to the coaſt. We muſt likewiſe add, that M. Chevalier's map does not agree with his calculation; that Mr. M.'s has no ſcale; and that Mr. Dalzell's* ſcale is compoſed of geographical miles. Another ground of complaint is, that none of our later travellers have condeſcended to mark Mr. Wood's two bridges, above and below the junction. Since we made our conjecture for placing New Ilium above the junction, upon conſulting the Edinburgh Tranſactions, we find that Pr. Heyne has the ſame doubt about ἔμπροσθεν†; and that Pr. Dalzell has removed Chevalier's New Ilium to the upper bridge. This tranſpoſition is important, becauſe then Chevalier's tomb of Ilus, the Θωμὸς; he has abandoned, may be aſſumed as a mark for the ruins of New Ilium, and we ſhall have one given point to proceed on. That tumulus, in Chevalier's map, is two miles and a half from the ſhore; in Pr. Dalzell's, upwards of three; and if we refer this to Strabo's ſite of New Ilium, at 12 ſtadia*, equal to a mile and a half, we obtain the accretion of the coaſt ſince his age. Allowing this then to be three miles, perhaps his eſtimate of 30 ſtadia, nearly four miles, to the Ilian village, will not fall much more than a mile ſhort of Bounar-bachi, by the calculation of Mr. Dallaway; and if we again allow that Homer's Troy was built in the plain, and that it might occupy a mile in breadth from the Scean Gate to the Acropolis on the height of Bounar-bachi, we ſhall effect a reconciliation between Homer, Strabo, and all our modern travellers. Homer ſays expreſsly,

ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλισο πόλις.

* Edinb. Tranſ. Tableau, p. 36. There is no other objection to this but the inconvenience of compariſon.

† See p. 94, Tableau.

* One inconſiſtency Strabo is accuſed of by Pr. Dalzell or Chevalier, of which he is not guilty; they ſay he makes New Ilium 12 ſtadia from the ſhore, p. 596; and 20 ſtadia, p. 598: but, in one inſtance, Strabo meaſures from New Ilium to the λιμὴν Ἀχαιῶν; and in the other, to the Νάυσαθμον. He diſtinguiſhes between the two; his Νάυσαθμον is at the mouth of the Scamander, which he places (erroneouſly perhaps) at Sigeum.

The

The city itſelf was on the plain, and we ſee no contradiction in this to the epithet ἠνεμοέσσα, to the πόλις ἄκρη, &c. The horſe alſo, which was to be thrown down the precipice (Od. Θ 508), was firſt to be *drawn up* the hill before the precipitation could take place.

Ἢ κατὰ πετράων βαλέειν, ἑρύσαντας ἀπ' ἄκρας.

This appears conſonant to the nature of fortified places in general, where the town is on level ground, the citadel on a height. The epithet ἰνρυάγυια, favours this idea; and the city conſiſting of three parts, Troja, Ilium, and Pergamus, favours this ſuppoſition of extent which we aſſign it on the plain. This hypotheſis (and as an hypotheſis only we give it), would bring the Scean Gate on a parallel with the fountains of the Scamander, or rather lower; it would explain the reaſon why the city was moſt aſſailable on this ſide, as being on the plain:

ἔνθα μάλιστα
Ἀμβατός ἐστι πόλις καὶ ἐπίδρομον ἔπλετο τεῖχος. Z. 434.

and it will accord better with the purſuit of Hector by Achilles, than any other poſition which can be aſſumed

On this latter head, Strabo and Pr. Heyne are at iſſue. Strabo undoubtedly underſtands Homer, as intimating a courſe *round the circumference* of the city; and no leſs undoubtedly he conſiders old Troy as built in the plain, which admitted of ſuch a courſe. Becauſe, ſays the geographer, the New Ilium cannot be traced round διὰ τὴν συνεχῆ ῥᾶχιν, *becauſe the ridge of rocky ground was without interruption.* It is evident, therefore, he conſidered Old Ilium as having no ſuch obſtacle, and did not admit the citadel on the height. This is his only point of difference from our hypotheſis; in every other reſpect, the ancients are reconciled by it to the modern accounts.

On the purſuit of Hector, we confeſs that we were never convinced by the arguments of Pr. Dalzell, or M. Che-

M. Chevalier; for, in regard to the inſtances he produces, for the uſage of περὶ, we ſaw as many proofs one way as the other; and one, acknowledged by Pr. Heynè, is as ſtrong as a thouſand;

τρὶς δ' ἐρύσας περὶ σῆμα*. (Ω. 16.)

But we do concede much to the points of flight which Pr. Heynè marks with his uſual penetration. The σκοπὴ, the ἐρινεὸς are in the front of Troy; the ſources of the Scamander are on its ſide; and nothing is mentioned on its rear. Still when we peruſe the whole paſſage, as it ſtands in Homer, (X. 130, &c.) the ideas of our youth recur, when we had no doubts; and if we heſitate in ſubmitting to authority, to the authority of a Heynè, we plead the authority of Strabo in our favour, a name to which we bow with a veneration, inferior to that only which we feel for Homer; and though we acknowledge ourſelves unequal to a conteſt with the Profeſſor, we ſtill are not without a degree of *ſcepticiſm* on this part of the queſtion.

Theſe differences of opinion we ſtate without fear of the conſequences; for it is the general face and character of the country on which we ground the conſiſtency of Homer, allowing that the minuter particulars could not be otherwiſe than diſputable after the revolution of ſo many centuries. But there is one difficulty propoſed by Mr. Bryant, which is not ſolved in a ſatisfactory manner by any of our travellers; which is, that reſpecting the ground occupied by the Grecian camp. If Homer has not mentioned Sigeum† and Rheteum by name, he has marked the promontories; and the expreſſion,

Ὅσον συνεέργαθον ἄκραι. Ξ. 36.

implies the occupation of the whole ‡ ſpace between

* Tableau, p. 86.

† The etymology of Sigeum and Rheteum is much diſputed; perhaps the oppoſition of *Silence* and *Noiſe*, from the nature of the current, or the winds might explain it. Σιγειον, from Σιγὴ and Σιγάω. Ροιτέιον from ροιζέω ῥοθίος and ῥοέω.

‡ Pr. Heyne is of a contrary opinion.

 them;

them; if ſo, Mr. B.'s objection, that the river muſt paſs through the camp and divide it, is a very ſtrong one; it is a *matter of fact*, and the only one which we concede to him, as having hitherto no ſatisfactory ſolution; and which we do moſt earneſtly recommend to the obſervation of future travellers. We are ready to acknowledge, that all mountain torrents are liable to a change of courſe; and we can ſuppoſe the inundations of the Simois to have forced the iſſue of the Scamander into different directions, either towards Sigeum, where Strabo places it, or to the Karalic Limne* near Rheteum, or into its preſent courſe. Still the mouth muſt have been between the two capes, and muſt interfere with the camp. It does not follow that this circumſtance is incapable of ſolution, becauſe no ſolution has been yet obtained; but, if otherwiſe, the whole topography is ſo generally conſiſtent, that it cannot be ſet aſide by a ſingle obſtacle. Leaving Mr. B. in poſſeſſion of this ground, as the only point ſtill tenable, we have no heſitation in declaring our decided confidence in the Diſcovery of M. Chevalier, and returning our warmeſt acknowledgments to Mr. Morritt, and the other gentlemen, who have thought it a duty, and not a mere point of curioſity, to decide his pretenſions on the ſpot. Not one of theſe travellers, however fluctuating in particulars, has heſitated to pronounce diſtinctly in favour of the whole; and their teſtimony is ſo ſtrong, as to the matter of fact, that unleſs Mr. B. will take a voyage to the Troad, (a labour, which we can only wiſh that he had youth and ſtrength to undertake) and conteſt the fact upon the ſpot, we muſt think him incompetent to invalidate an evidence ſo generally complete in all its parts.

Our veneration for Homer may have been the cauſe of lengthening this diſquiſition beyond the uſual limits of our plan, and beyond the labour that can generally be beſtowed upon a work of an hundred and twenty-four pages; but our readers will hereby have the whole ſtate of the controverſy before them, in as moderate a compaſs as the nature of the queſtion will allow, and we

* *Blind Lake.* See Dallaway, Tableau, and Morritt's Map.

have

have the ſame defence to ſet up as Strabo pleaded eighteen centuries ago,

.....τὴν αἰτίαν τῦ μήκους μὴ ἡμῖν μᾶλλον ἀνάπτοιεν οἱ ἐντυγχάνοντες, ἢ τοῖς σφόδρα ποθοῦσι τὴν τῶν ἐνδόξων καὶ παλαιῶν γνῶσιν· προσλαμβάνει δὲ τῷ μήκει καὶ οἱ συγγραφεῖς, ἐνίοτε τὰ αὐτὰ γεγράφοντες περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν, οὐδὲ σαφῶς πάντα. P. 581.

We, and all who have received a liberal education, have imbibed the love of Homer in our youth, and cheriſh it through life; we return to his poems a thouſand times with repeated pleaſure, and we diſcover new excellencies upon every peruſal. We ourſelves certainly conſider him not as the poet of Greece only, but of the world at large. We contemplate his ſcenery of nature, and wiſh by turns for the pencil of a Claude, a Pouſſin, or a Salvator Roſa. We view his picture of life and manners, and diſcover the great outline of human nature, the character not of the individual, but the ſpecies: we examine his geography*, and find it correct even to a brook, and juſt even to an epithet. We put his hiſtory to the teſt by which we judge all other hiſtory, and we ſee that it is connected with events prior, ſubſequent, and collateral; and if, after having theſe perceptions excited in our minds, we are to be told that this is a deluſion, a dream, and the baſeleſs fabric of a viſion, we ſuffer a moral injury; and we ſay, that the love of ſyſtem, and the diſplay of erudition, ſhall not be pleaded in extenuation of the offence. But it is aſſerted, that the pre-eminent excellence of the poems is granted, and that this is not injured by reducing the hiſtory to a ſplendid fiction. We anſwer, that the ſtrong character of truth is one of the

* The general truth of this even Mr. Bryant would concede; why then heſitate about the Troad only? Mr. Wood has treated this ſubject with judgment; and who will deny that every epithet has its appropriate meaning, when that of Τειχιόεσσαν, which is uſed twice only, once to Tiryns, and once to Gortyna, carries its peculiarity with it in regard to Gortyna, as late as Strabo's notice; and that of Tiryns is ſtill applicable, as Mr. M. who has viſited it, aſſerts. See Strabo, lib. 10, p. 478.

higheſt excellencies of Homer's deſcriptive writing; and though poetry may excel without hiſtory to ſupport it, as appears by the Eneid, where the deception floats upon the ſurface; and though it may not be the better for being hiſtorical, as is the caſe with the Pharſalia; yet, in the Iliad, both hiſtory and poetry are ſo blended, and afford each other ſo mutual a ſupport, that if the hiſtory is denied,

Οὐ γὰρ ἔτι σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα ἶνες ἔχουσιν,
Ψυχὴ δ' ἠύτ' ὄνειρος ἀποπταμένη πεπότηται. Od. Λ. 218.

It is like depriving the ſoul of a body; it is preſerving a ghoſt inſtead of a living ſpirit. But if Greece is to be robbed of the honour of the Trojan war, and Homer is to looſe his claim to the character of an hiſtorian, why is all this glory to be transferred to Egypt? What is there in either of Homer's poems, that bears any reſemblance to Egyptian habits, cuſtoms, manners, or morals; to Egyptian rites, ceremonies, genius, or taſte? In Egypt every ſpecimen of art is either tame and graceleſs, or elſe coloſſal groteſque and heterogeneous; in Homer, every thing is proportionate, animated, natural, and conſiſtent. We would as readily grant that a ſwather of mummies, or a ſculptor of Anubis, could have executed the Venus of Praxiteles, as that the fabric of the Iliad could have been raiſed upon an Egyptian model.

POSTSCRIPT.

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the publication of the foregoing remarks, Mr. Bryant has printed, but not publiſhed, an Anſwer to Mr. Morritt's Vindication, &c. in which he complains of very harſh and uncandid treatment from that gentleman; but as Mr. B. in return has charged his adverſary with *falſe accuſation** and *evaſion*, with *raſhneſs*†, *blindneſs*, and *miſapprehenſion*, with *begging*‡ *the queſtion*, with *perverſion*§ *of Hiſtory*, and finally, with *ignorance*, we cannot help obſerving, that upon ſettling the balance of the whole account, Mr. Morritt has received rather more than he has paid; and we muſt confeſs, that with the moſt perfect reſpect for Mr. Bryant, as a man of probity and learning, if we were to incur the ſame imputation for venturing to contradict his opinions, or for combating his hypotheſis, we are ready to ſhare in the reproach.

In this treatiſe Mr. B. has again reverted to the improbabilities which accompany the Hiſtory of the Trojan war, the inconſiſtencies found in the account of Helen, the collection of the army, the ſtate of the fleet, &c. &c. in all which, except that

> Qui ſplendeat unus et alter
> Aſſuitur pannus.

the queſtion ſtands juſt where it did before. No one is ſo abſurd as to believe or maintain that Helen was born of an egg. But Mr. B. ought to prove that ſhe was never born at all, that ſhe never exiſted, that the Hiſtory of Tyndarus, of Pelops, and their families, is a total fiction; that there never was a Trojan War.

* P. 30. † P. 32. ‡ P. 46. § P. 49.

This

This he has attempted; and we deny his proofs. We allow as much fable and mythology as Mr. B. can require; but we believe the fable to be grafted upon a reality, and that the hiſtory is not raiſed upon the fable. We conceive that improbabilities impeach no hiſtory whatever. Nothing could be more improbable than the Macedonian conqueſt of Aſia, or the Norman conqueſt of Apulia and Sicily; and we maintain that no fiction grafted upon hiſtory, abrogates the hiſtory itſelf. We neither believe the prodigies of Livy, or Matthew * Paris's legend of Ulſtan's ſtaff: but we ſtill think there were ſuch men as Valerius Corvus, Decius, and William the Conqueror; and if we can allow this indulgence to an hiſtorian, ſome extenſion of privilege may ſurely be conceded to a poet. Try the Iliad by this ſtandard, and with all its fictions, it is ſtill an hiſtory.

But if Mr. Bryant is ſo exceedingly offended by the animadverſions of his opponents, which he challenged and braved†, Mr. Chevalier and Mr. Morritt have a much juſter ground of complaint, when he accuſes the one of framing his map, not on the ſpot, but from memory‡, at Salonika; and the other with copying it ſupinely without diſcrimination or judgment of his own, with retaining all its blemiſhes, and adopting all its errors. Let us then ſuppoſe that Mr. Chevalier had a ſyſtem of his own, as well as Mr. Bryant; let us grant that Mr. Morritt had a bias upon his judgment, a prejudice in favour of Homer, and againſt Mr. Bryant. Still this is not accuſation enough, but the charge muſt be extended to Meſſrs. Liſton, Hawkins, Dallaway, Stockdale, and Berners: all theſe gentlemen muſt be blind and prejudiced, and all muſt declare, in oppoſition to the evidence of their ſenſes, that they ſaw in the Troad, what they did not ſee, and that they bore teſtimony in favour of Mr. Chevalier from enmity to Mr. Bryant.—As for ourſelves, we declare our belief in

* See Mat. Paris, p. 17. Anno 1095.

† See Preface to the Diſſertation.

‡ This he notices as remarked in the Britiſh Critic. But how far a man may have compoſed on the ſpot, or drawn, or corrected afterwards, ought to be determined upon a view of his map by ſubſequent travellers.

their

their report, but with this reſerve, that whenever an equal number of witneſſes, equally entitled to credit, ſhall contradict their evidence by a new ſurvey on the ſpot, we are ready to retract the whole of what has been advanced; and to concur with Mr. B. in the examination of any other ſyſtem he may have to propoſe.

In the mean time we muſt reaſſert our opinion in regard to Strabo's miſtaken idea of the Simois; becauſe, however Mr. Bryant may accord with him and Mr. Wood, the tranſpoſition of the two rivers is a fact that admits of demonſtration. For

Firſt, There are only three rivers that unite below the Mountains, the Thymbrius, and the other two which are diſputed, and the Thymbrius is foreign to the queſtion.

Secondly. Homer and Strabo agree that the other two do join, See Hom. E. 774. And Strabo, who ſays they unite [ἐμπροσθεν] in the front of the New Ilium.

Thirdly. Homer mentions the battle fought in the plain between the two ſtreams, and Strabo mentions two ſtreams, one flowing on the Rhetean ſide, and the other on the Sigean ſide of the plain.

Fourthly. Homer's Scamander is on the Sigean ſide, becauſe he ſays, his Scamander was on the left of the Trojan line, as it moved down the plain from the city towards the Sea. But

Strabo's Scamander is on the Rhetean ſide, becauſe he aſſerts it is the ſame ſtream as divides Cebrenia from Palæ Scepſis, and receives the Andrius.

Fifthly. After excluding the Thymbrius, there are no two ſtreams which unite on the plain, or near new Ilium, but the two deſcribed exactly alike by Strabo and Chevalier, though under contrary names: and if the fact is credible upon the evidence given by the other Engliſh gentlemen, that the channel of Chevalier's Scamander has been changed, then is his Scamander, the Scamander of Homer.

Sixthly. Mr. Bryant's deſire to make the Scamander a large and deep river, cannot be accompliſhed, as long as we read that a ſingle tree made a bridge over it, that the troops repeatedly forded it, that Priam's chariot and waggon croſſed it, and that Achilles fought in the middle of it, &c. &c.

Mr.

Mr. B. ſeems to ſpeak with leſs confidence of his Egyptian Troy in this treatiſe than in his two former. It is now a ſuggeſtion, or an hypotheſis. But even an hypotheſis muſt have ſome ground of connection. There ought to be ſome account of a war at this Egyptian Troy, (whether a *village*, or a *city*) if it were no better founded than the war of the Indian Deities as related in the Maha-bárat; or the war of the Titans in the Phlegrean plain.—Where are we to look for this hiſtory?—If no where to be found, what connexion has the Troy in Egypt with the Troy Aſiatick, more than the accidental coincidence of names? There are many mountains called Ida and Olympus, and Calpe, and many cities called Thebes. They may all be related by etymology, without a ſhadow of hiſtorical connexion; and, perhaps, no one will think that Mr. B. has aſcertained a war at his Egyptian Troy*, by proving that Memnon was an Ethiopian.

The latter part of Mr. B.'s treatiſe is employed chiefly in proving the Eneid to be a fiction, and that there was no colony of Trojans in Italy. On this head, there is, perhaps, no contrariety of opinions in the preſent age, and it is only noticed here, that a conceſſion in this caſe may not be interpreted into an application of the ſame principle to the Iliad. With this obſervation we take our leave of the controverſy for the preſent, aſſuring Mr. B. that however we have thought it a duty from conviction, to combat his opinions, we ſtill acknowledge our unfeigned reſpect to his talents, to his learning, and to that vigour of mind which he poſſeſſes, at a time of life when other men ſeek only quiet and repoſe; and if any aſperity of language has eſcaped us,

Τᾶυτα δ' ὄπισθεν ἀρεσσόμεθ', εἴ τι κακὸν ἰῦν
Εἰρηται, τάδε πάντα Θεοὶ μεταμώλια θεῖεν.

* Diſſert. p. 60.

FINIS.